

REMARKS

Applicants have amended claims 1, 3, 12 and 18 to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as their inventions, and respectfully submit that all pending claims are placed in position for allowance, for the following reasons:

Claim Objections

Part 1) Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

More specifically, Examiner states that, in claim 1, the phrase "said projections supporting the electrical device to prevent the conductive member from electrically touching the parts of the retention bodies of other terminals adjacent said terminal" is not clear. **How this occurs is not clear since ever without projection 321 the conductive members will not touch retention members of adjacent contacts. No such touching seems possible in FIG. 4 system.**

In claim 12, Examiner also states that the phrase "said projections supporting the electrical device and the height of said projections is higher enough than said distance to prevent the conductive member from electrically engaging the parts of the retention bodies of other terminal adjacent said terminal" is not clear.

In response, as disclosed in the description of the prior art section of the application and clearly shown in FIG.14, when the conductive member has a relatively large engaging bottom surface and the bottom surface is compressed to engage with a corresponding terminal, since the retention body has a part thereof extended toward the electrical device and in flush with said mounting surface, the bottom surface of the conductive member is prone to electrically touch the parts of the retention bodies of other terminal adjacent said terminal if **without projection**

321.

Accordingly, Applicants earnestly submit that claim 1 has particularly pointed out and distinctly claimed the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

Additionally, Applicants have amended claim 12 by getting rid of the unclear phrase, and respectfully submit that amended claim 12 particularly points out and distinctly claims the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

In view of the above, the rejections to pending claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, should be withdrawn.

Part 2) Claims 1-5, 7-16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Admitted Prior Art (APA) in view of Maldonado (U.S. Pat. No. 6,604,950)

In response, firstly, in Maldonado, the so-called projections 26, 32 are only used for contact with components 12, 14 (see col. 5, ll. 58 to 60 and FIG. 1), thereby spacing and supporting the components 12, 14.

On the merits of Maldonado, to receive the electrical conductors 16 in the frame 22, channels 28 are necessarily defined in the frame 22. Naturally, the projections 26 and 32 of Maldonado are formed on opposite sides of the channels.

Further, the projections 26 and 32 of Maldonado are devised for contact with the components 12, 14 to assure electrical engagement between the conductors 16 and contacts 18, 20.

Additionally, there is nothing disclosed in Maldonado to teach or suggest that the so-called projections 26, 32, through supporting the components 12, 14, are adapted to prevent contacts 18, 20 from electrically touching midsections 56, respectively.

It is, therefore, respectfully submitted that the feature "said projections supporting the electrical device to prevent the conductive member from electrically touching the parts of the retention bodies of other terminals adjacent said terminal" can not be found from the projections 26 and 32 of Maldonado. Namely, there is no suggestion or teaching in Maldonado to modify the socket of APA to reach anyone of the inventions respectively claimed in amended claims 1, 12 and 18.

Secondly, even if Maldonado can be qualified to combine with APA, said combination still fails to show or disclose:

- "wherein said projections are interspersed on said mounting surface and one projection is disposed around a corresponding terminal-passageway", recited in amended claim 1;
- "said terminal-passageways being arranged in rows and said projections essentially standing on corresponding rows, respectively", recited in amended claim 12; or
- "wherein said projections are discrete and discontinued from one another in the direction (*defined by each of the rows*)" recited in amended claim 18.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claims 1, 12 and 18 each are defined patentably over Maldonado and APA and any combination thereof, and should be allowed.

Claims 2-3 and 5 and 7-11 are dependent on patentable amended claim 1 and hence should be allowed.

Claims 13-16 are dependent on patentably amended claim 12 and should, therefore, be allowed.

Part 3) Claims 6 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Admitted Prior Art (APA) in view of Maldonado and further in

view of Eldride (U.S. Pat. No. 6,705,876)

In response, as taught by Maldonado, all the so-called projections of Maldonado parallel extend through the bottom wall along a direction, one projection staying between two adjacent rows of conductors (see FIGS. 1-7, 8-11 and 13). Further, as taught by Eldride, all the so-called projections of Maldonado should be arranged at in interspersed manner and each thereof should be disposed around a corresponding terminal-passageway. As a result, more than one of the parallel projections of Maldonado stays between two adjacent rows of conductors. Apparently, the teaching proposed deviates away the spirit of Maldonado. Namely, there is no suggestion found on Eldride to modify the projections of Maldonado to be combined with the socket of APA to reach the invention claimed in amended claim 1, and hence said combination is not logical (see *Pro-Mold & Tool Company v. Great Lakes Plastics, Inc.*, 75 F.3d 1568 (Fed. Cir. 1996)). Much less to say that the mis-modified projections are provided on the socket of APA to reach the invention claimed in amended claim 1.

However, to reach the invention claimed in amended claim 1, the so-called projections of Maldonado must be interspersed on a side of the bottom wall and one projection should be disposed around a corresponding terminal-passageway, as recited in amended claim 1.

Further, even though the three prior can be combined to reach the invention respectively claimed in amended claim 1, aid combination of that much prior art proves that the invention of claim 1 is difficult to be anticipated by the those who are skilled in the art at the time that the invention was made, and hence unobvious per se.

In view of above, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 is defined patentably over Maldonado, APA and Eldride and any combination thereof, and should be allowed.

Claim 6 is dependent on amended claim 1 and should be allowed.

Regarding claim 12, as taught by Maldonado, all the so-called projections of Maldonado parallel extend through the bottom wall along a direction, one projection staying between two adjacent rows of conductors. No matter what Eldride teaches, the so-called projections of Maldonado must stand on corresponding rows of conductors to reach the invention claimed in amended claim 12. However, since the so-called projections of Maldonado are characterized in that they extend through the whole bottom wall, after the so-called projections of Maldonado provided on the socket of APA, they will block the mouth of each terminal-passageway and prevent the terminal from extending beyond the mounting surface or intervene work of the terminals, thereby making the socket prone to be inoperable.

Speaking differently, there is no suggestion found on Eldride to modify the projections of Maldonado to be combined with the socket of APA to reach the invention claimed in amended claim 12, and hence said combination is also illogical (see *Pro-Mold & Tool Company v. Great Lakes Plastics, Inc.*, 75 F.3d 1568 (Fed. Cir. 1996)). Much less to say that the mis-modified projections can be provided on the socket of APA to reach the invention claimed in amended claim 12.

Further, even though the three prior can be combined to reach the invention respectively claimed in amended claim 12, aid combination of that much prior art proves that the inventions each are difficult to be anticipated by the those who are skilled in the art at the time that the invention was made, and hence unobvious per se.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 12 is defined patentably over Maldonado, APA and Eldride and any combination thereof, and should be allowed.

Claim 17 is dependent on patentable amended claim 12 and should also be

allowed.

The newly added claim 19 defines the projection being engaged with the corresponding conductive pad in a vertical direction perpendicular to said direction, which is not disclosed in the cited references.

The newly added claim 20 defines more than one projections closely surrounding each corresponding passageway, which is not disclosed in the cited references.

The newly added claim 21 defines the conductive pad being larger than the corresponding projection aside, which is not disclosed in the cited references.

Accordingly, the added claims 19-21 are believed to patentably distinguish over the cited references based upon not only their dependencies upon claim 18 but also their own respective allowabilities.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that all the pending claims are patentably distinguishable from the prior art. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is now placed in condition for allowance, and that an action to this effect is earnestly requested.

Respectfully submitted,

LIAO ET AL

By 

Wei Te Chung

Registration No.: 43,325

Foxconn International, Inc.

P. O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive,

Santa Clara, CA 95050

Tel No.: (408) 919-6137